

274
Har
AC
901
AI
no 501
TOTAL ABSTINENCE

VERSUS

MODERATION:

A CALM CONSIDERATION

OF

THE REV. JACOB STANLEY'S PAMPHLET

ENTITLED

“TEETOTALISM CALMLY CONSIDERED,” &c.

BY A METHODIST WATER DRINKER.

PRINCIPLES NOT MEN.

“Which now of these three (the Priest, Levite, and Samaritan,) thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves? And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. Then said Jesus, Go thou and do likewise.”—*Luke* x. 36, 37.

LONDON:

J. PASCO, 12, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

HULL:

ADVERTISEMENT.

I am sorry that no other Wesleyan Minister or Layman has come forward to reply to the Pamphlet of the Rev. J. Stanley, especially as it is well known that his opinions on this subject will have great weight with vast numbers in the Body, who are acquainted with his high character and superior talents. I regret it the more as many in the Society, who are Total Abstiners, are well qualified for such an undertaking, and would have done ample justice to the subject in the way of vindication and defence. I feel my own incompetency, but as things appeared to me so I have written, with plainness and fidelity. Two other replies have already issued from the press, both of them excellent in their kind, but neither of them by Methodist Authors. To these, I refer in an appendix to the Pamphlet, pointing out their chief excellencies and defects. I will now leave with confidence, the arguments I have advanced, to be canvassed by the Public.

TOTAL ABSTINENCE

VERSUS

MODERATION.

It would be almost superfluous to state, that the name under which I have introduced myself to the public, is intended to convey the idea that I personally abstain from all intoxicating drinks. I do this because I think in my case they are wholly unnecessary, but I am not prepared to say that in other cases they may not be taken (of course moderately) even as a beverage, not only without detriment, but also with some benefit. I am rather inclined to think they may be so taken, for the reasons assigned by Mr. Stanley in his Pamphlet, pages 16, 17, and 18, namely, that "Vineyards were among the blessings which God bestowed upon his people in the land of Canaan," that "Christ drank wine himself and permitted and sanctioned it in others," and that "Christ appointed wine to be used in the commemoration of his death." I do, as strongly as Mr. S. condemn the extreme and untenable position taken by some total abstainers, that it is unscriptural, and consequently sinful to touch at all, inebriating drinks. But the question with me is, whether on the supposition of a dietetical use, I ought not to forego altogether, a *sinless* practice of *moderate* drinking, if by such means I may induce others to abandon a *sinful* practice of *immoderate* drinking, prevailing on them, *by my example*, to abstain altogether from intoxicating drinks, a remedy which Mr. S. repeatedly admits is essential in the case of drunkards.

I will now address myself to the contents of the pamphlet under consideration. It would seem that Mr. S. quarrels not only with the manner in which the total abstinence system has sometimes been advocated, but also with the system itself, and thinks that moderation is enjoined in the Scripture, so that the Total Abstinence Society sins by *defect*, where drunkards sin by *excess*. In reply to this I remark, that where moderation is enjoined in the use of that which is proper, it is so enjoined with a view to guard against excess, but it does not follow that a person or society are wrong because they choose for certain reasons to forego their right. Besides the moderation-man (supposing such a case) cannot remain a moderation-man if he has been *accustomed* to the immoderate use of inebriating drinks, as he will inevitably glide by *means* of allowed, limited drinking which constitutes moderation, into disallowed, excessive drinking which constitutes intemperance. It then becomes a serious con-

sideration whether the only true moderation in such cases is not entire abstinence from all intoxicating drinks. Even Mr. S. with a strange inconsistency gives up his favourite moderation principle when he would recover a drunkard, since moderation in that case he frankly confesses would never do, as it would lead most certainly to intemperate excess. So thinks the Total Abstinence Society, and as it is a society to reclaim drunkards, it attempts it not by means inadequate, but requires total abstinence as the only remedy. Surely Mr. Stanley has no right to find fault with a society which acts consistently when it would recover drunkards by the only means available in such a case, according to his own recorded opinion. He may indeed say, the society condemns those who are moderate drinkers, and who are in no danger of forming intemperate habits. But, no: the society *as a society* does not, though persons *in* the society may do so, and it is not right to enter a protest against an association, of illiberality, merely because some of its members choose to make sweeping condemnatory allegations. The society only asks the moderation-man to forego his right which he *does not* abuse, for the sake of the intemperate man who *does* so abuse it. The example of the moderate man is acknowledged to be inefficient even if attempted to be followed, and the society asks nothing unreasonable when it requests an example which, if followed, must necessarily be efficient.

That I have not misrepresented Mr. S.'s recorded views on this subject, I think evident from what he intimates in the first paragraph of his "Preface," and from what he asserts in the fourth, in allusion to "the Rev. John Angel James, whose recent letter on the wine controversy, is at once honourable to his head and heart." He there says, "There are among them (the advocates of total abstinence) men of great candour and christian courtesy, who whilst on the principle of expediency, they approve of total abstinence as the best remedy for drunkenness, pronounce no uncharitable judgment upon those who are of a contrary opinion." I presume from this statement, that Mr. S. ranks himself with the latter class of persons, who are opposed to the principle of a "Total Abstinence Society," and the whole drift of his pamphlet confirms me in this presumption. He claims for himself however, the promotion of "Christian morality on Christian principles," and as he is decidedly averse to "*insinuations*," we cannot in charity suppose that he means to insinuate a contrary object to those from whom he "may innocently differ;" I shall therefore take it for granted he does not mean, that "Christian morality on Christian principles" cannot be advanced by a society that may as "innocently differ" in opinion from him.

His first page concedes the necessity of total abstinence in certain cases; and yet a society formed with a view to promote such an object is regarded with opposition and dislike! He says, "It

is no new doctrine, but one which has always been taught and insisted upon, that the only safety for a drunkard is in total abstinence." Yet a society formed expressly to teach and insist upon the same thing, is frowned upon, because it happens to be a new agency for promoting more efficiently the operation of an old doctrine.

Mr. S. asks, "What has this (namely total abstinence) to do with persons of temperance habits?" It has nothing to do with them *personally* but it has something to do with them *relatively*. They are not requested for personal reasons to abstain but that they may show an example of abstinence which if followed will cure drunkenness where it does prevail. A pledge intended for the cure of an evil which in their case does not exist, may nevertheless be given with a view to cure an evil where it does exist. "Look not every man" saith the Apostle "on his *own* things, but every man also on the things of *others*."

The three following pages, namely the 8th, 9th, and 10th, are intended to combat a notion which is not embraced by the Total Abstinence Society *as such*, whatever may be the views of some of its members. I do not myself entertain the opinion that "a moderate use of fermented or alcoholic drinks" is injurious to man, physically, mentally, and morally: though the Rev. G. B. Macdonald may think so, it does not necessarily follow that the society of which he is a vice-president, must think so too; this is a question left open by the society, for each member to form his own opinion. I pass over therefore, this part of the pamphlet as fully expressing my own sentiments. Mr. S. and myself are perfectly agreed that no *personal* injury is sustained by the moderate use of inebriating drinks; that no *relative* injury is inflicted is the main question upon which we differ.

Mr. S. goes on to state the various reasons usually assigned by total abstainers for the principle of total abstinence and these he proposes "candidly to examine."

He adduces as a first reason *the power of example*. This I consider the main argument. "Total abstinence will induce drunkards also to abstain." This is the pith and marrow of the subject. Here the matter is considered relatively. But what does Mr. S. say to this? He says, first, that example to be influential must be *visible*. So say I; but is not that saying that example *if* visible is likely to be influential? "But" says Mr. S. "as drunkards in general have no access to the privacies of the domestic life of the temperate part of the community, they cannot know whether they do or do not abstain;" all this proceeds on the principle that total abstinence if satisfactorily ascertained would tell favourably on the reformation of the drunkard. Well then if the drunkard cannot penetrate into the recesses of retirement, here is a visible community of abstainers to whom he has access, an asylum to which he may resort and they challenge

scrutiny of their conduct the most rigid, by the very publicity which marks their profession. Besides Mr. Stanley's objection involves an innuendo (and yet to "insinuations" he has an inveterate dislike) reflecting upon the moral honesty of the parties in question, who though they make a public and open profession of abstinence may nevertheless for anything that drunkards can say to the contrary, habitually violate that profession in private with impunity. Is this, I ask, creditable to the gentleman from whom it comes, and does not every principle of honour rise indignant at the hated calumny? But this objection I will not dismiss. Allow me to put it in another form. The Rev. Jacob Stanley is a minister in a connexion which requires sobriety as a condition of membership. He who becomes a member makes a public profession of such sobriety. But the example is inadequate as a public profession may be belied by a private delinquency. So it may, but would it not be base in me to insinuate that such was the case, merely because I had no access to the hearth and the home of the professing individual? How then am I to know that the Rev. Jacob Stanley is a sober man, especially when I am given to understand by the Rev. gentleman that he drinks in moderation? He may for any thing I know to the contrary, exceed the bounds of moderation and commit in "the privacies of life" the awful sin of "bestly intoxication." But should I not deserve to be scouted from all honourable society were I to insinuate such delinquency in opposition to his public profession, except indeed I had evidence from personal observation or satisfactory testimony to the contrary. I am morally bound in the absence of all contrary evidence, to believe the public profession of strict sobriety on the part of the Rev. gentleman while he remains a member of such a community, and he is equally bound in similar circumstances, to credit the public profession of entire abstinence on the part of the total abstainer while he remains a member of the Total Abstinence Society. Besides all public bodies have a system of surveillance and a code of discipline, by which sooner or later they detect and expel the unworthy members of their respective communities. If then Mr. S. remains in the Wesleyan society, his position as an acknowledged member is testimony sufficient in the absence of positive proof to the contrary, that he is a temperate and sober man. The same remark will apply with equal force and propriety to a member of the total abstinence community.

But it is further objected to the argument of example adduced by total abstainers, that such example is completely powerless on the conduct of others. I reply, whether others will imitate it or not, the example itself is a powerful protest against the prevalent evil; but numbers have been influenced solely by example to try the experiment and have been reclaimed. This is a fact whatever the result of such cases would

occur, and "facts" be it remembered "are stubborn things." It is indeed attempted to argue the powerlessness of such example from its failure in other instances. But the cases with which it is attempted to be compared are not parallel ones: they are purely religious, but besides its morality this is regarded as one of temporal advantage chiefly. I need not say how much more influential a temporal consideration is, than a spiritual one, with the class of persons attempted to be reclaimed.—All religious persons regret it, but so it is, that drunkards think more of the body than the soul, and more of temporal weal than of spiritual and eternal good.—Many a poor drunkard regrets the vice in which he indulges and often purposes to amend his ways, that he may escape misery, and avoid beggary, disgrace, and ruin. He therefore tries the moderate principle, but it always fails, and after trying it repeatedly in vain he at last gives himself up to despair. How keenly in his sober moments does he feel his wretchedness! But a society comes and invites him to abstain and to pledge himself to that effect. He sees some of his old companions "clothed and sitting in their right mind." His desires for reformation are met and seconded by examples of a pleasing character. He resolves, I will try it too, and the result is that totally abstaining he becomes reformed.

As a last and crowning objection it is said, "Our Lord furnished no such example." What then? Does it follow that he forbids others to abstain if they choose it? Did the Bible condemn Sampson, Jehonadab the son of Rechab, Daniel and his Hebrew companions, and John the Baptist, in this particular? Does our Lord ever frown on the sect of the Essenes for their conscientious scruples? Yet his practice was opposed to theirs and differed materially from all the preceding instances. "The most judicious critics" says Mr. Macdonald "give it as their judgment that the statement in Acts xviii. 18, of Paul 'having a vow,' refers to the obligation under which he had laid himself by the vow of a Nazarite to abstain totally from wine and strong drink. The admiration which Timothy entertained for Paul seems to have induced him to copy the Apostle's example most rigidly." What are we to say to all these cases standing as they do in opposition to the example of our Lord? Why simply that he was right in using wine, and they were not wrong in refusing it, as it was a matter purely optional, involving no guilt in its use, and equally involving no guilt in its rejection. The writer says, "Had total abstinence been necessary to the cure of drunkenness he would no doubt not have failed to observe it." Why, in the case of all drunkards, total abstinence is essentially necessary, Mr. S. himself being witness, and if another who is not a drunkard chooses to abstain fully for example's sake, where is the harm of it? Mr. Stanley says, "Wherever the evil (of intemperance) exists

lutely requires it; and should any one think that by his abstaining he can rescue a poor drunkard from his deep degradation, christian charity binds him at once to make the sacrifice." Why then find fault with total abstainers who do thus think and practice accordingly? But I have not quite done with this most formidable objection.—"Had total abstinence, in the estimation of our Lord, been necessary to the cure of drunkenness he would no doubt not have failed to observe it. To suppose that he would not is utterly incredible." Is it indeed? But who says it is necessary—absolutely so—that I, a sober man, in order to benefit another, an intemperate man, should entirely abstain from all intoxicating drinks? Not the Total Abstinence Society. It does indeed employ this as *one* means to an end, and as the society has found it to succeed, its members willingly forego their right for the benefit of others. The society, be it remembered, is based not so much on the principle of necessity as expediency, not so much on what is requisite, as on what is suitable to an end.

The next plea for total abstinence, mentioned in page 13, I summarily dismiss as I do not take it to be a valid one, and this is a subject on which we "may innocently differ." Mr. S.'s exposure of it is an able one, and deserves to be read carefully by all who take the extreme view which he opposes. It behoves such to ponder seriously his remarks on the use of wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, found in pages 16 and 18 of his pamphlet. The notion of an unfermented wine used on the occasion by our Lord is a fallacy and merits to be exploded not only as unscientific but absurd. The Rev. G. B. Macdonald indeed states, "I wonder that it does not occur to many persons who urge the argument from precedent very earnestly, that after all it is not an argument of analogy." In proof of this he goes into a statement of the wide difference between the "modern wines drunk in this country" and "those of Palestine." But this after all does not invalidate the argument taken from analogy. Does Mr. Macdonald never administer the Sacrament with wine that is not strictly oriental? The analogy is between wines fermented and fermented wines, and that in this country there is a spirituous admixture is merely circumstantial, or perhaps more properly speaking is essential, as "alcohol is mixed with them in order to keep them from turning sour, and (by consequence) to suit the taste of the consumers." Mr. S.'s closing observations on wine used in commemoration of our Lord's death are, I conceive, conclusive and unanswerable.

The third reason said to be assigned for total abstinence requires a more particular consideration. The manner in which it is stated by Mr. S. (page 19) is calculated to convey an idea which was never intended to be obtruded by total abstainers upon society: the idea is that urging total abstinence upon the drunk-

gospel morality, are two very different and even opposite things, than which nothing can be more false in fact. Mr. S. as we have seen, admits that nothing short of total abstinence will do for the drunkard, and therefore to enforce it, is to enforce the morality of the gospel in one of its most important and essential branches. To teach entire abstinence as "the cure of drunkenness" is to preach the gospel as "the cure of drunkenness:" the only difference, if difference there exists, is that the gospel teaches comprehensively christian morals, but total abstinence confines itself exclusively as I have said, to one branch of christian morality. The gospel, Mr. S. himself being the preacher, says to the drunkard, "You must totally abstain or you will be ensnared and ruined:" the total abstainer but re-echoes the voice of the preacher and the mandate of the gospel.

But why does Mr. S. place total abstinence in opposition to the gospel when total abstainers do nothing of the kind; they on the contrary (with Mr. S. on their side, though he thinks they take a very different view of the subject) affirm that total abstinence is a part of the gospel just as a part is comprehended in the whole: it is I repeat it, preaching the gospel against the sin of drunkenness. Mr. S.'s argument on this head, founded on the principle of opposite agencies falls necessarily to the ground. "The teetotallers" have *not* "discovered a more effectual remedy for moral evil than our Lord ever discovered," so that they are *not* chargeable with "blasphemy," or "at least one of the grossest libels ever uttered against the gospel or its Founder." They do not "suppose that teetotalism is more effectual towards the removal of evil than the gospel," for this would be to suppose that the gospel *in part*, is more effectual than the gospel *as a whole*. But it is not so for the removal of evil in general, as it only contemplates the cure of one species of evil in particular, except indeed on the principle of concatenation, where one evil involves many others, so that the removal of that evil secures the removal of them all. What follows therefore, respecting our Lord's ignorance "of the best method of removing evil," or unwillingness "that it should be so removed," is wide of the question and inappropriate to the subject.

He next asks a question (page 20) and remarks upon it, "But is it really a fact, that *many* drunkards have been permanently reclaimed by teetotalism? That some have I believe is the fact; but on this subject there has been great exaggeration." At any rate it is admitted "some" have been reclaimed, and these *some* are an ample reward for all the labour that has been expended upon them. Does Mr. S. regret that he has preached the gospel against drunkenness and thus discharged his duty, although he may not have been successful in reclaiming "*many* drunkards?" The "*some*" however Mr. S. would have us believe, have dwindled away to an insignificant few: for "is it not a fact" he asks,

“that several of these (!) have relapsed into their former habits?” It may be that some who were reformed drunkards have relapsed, but that is their fault, not the fault of the system; and many of these relapses may be easily accounted for. There are numbers who pledge themselves to entire abstinence for a limited period, say from one to six months by way of experiment. While the pledge is binding they refrain altogether, but no sooner is the time expired than they think themselves at liberty to take *a little*, and as might be expected, “it has happened unto them according to the true proverb, the dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.” In the case of drunkards, permanent recovery depends upon permanent abstinence; and unless limited pledges are renewed and extended, relapses almost inevitably follow. To say that conversion is necessary to give permanence to recently formed habits of sobriety is to say *too much*. Have there been no honest, benevolent, and honourable men, who remained such through life; and yet were never the subjects of conversion? Conversion indeed furnishes additional and higher motives to a sober life; and hence the pious total abstainer, seeks the conversion as well as the reformation of the drunkard, well knowing that without it, even a sober man “cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” The Total Abstinence Society facilitates this object, as it brings by means of its pious members, the reformed drunkards to the house of God. Were it not for this agency, numbers who are now consistent members of Christian society, would have remained “in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity.” But their sabbath resort has been abandoned, and another has since been sought, where “they heard words whereby they were saved.” Mr. S. as a Wesleyan Minister is under vast obligation to this society as pioneer, for a large accession of members to the body. Were there only seven hundred and thirty Cornish Methodists “*all teetotallers*,” reclaimed by this society, this would be a delightful triumph; but there are many more not only in Cornwall, but in all parts of the united kingdom, who have entered the Wesleyan ranks since their recovery to sober habits, and I may add, that numbers already *in* the society have been converted since they became total abstainers.

Mr. S. makes a great fuss about “the tens of thousands who have signed the pledge,” and insinuates (O this insinuation!) that an unfair use is made of this fact in favour of the total abstinence principle; as if, he says, “ninety-nine in every hundred were not all temperance (moderation) persons.” But at any rate they were not all total abstainers, and the society professes to have made them such; so that the ninety-nine as well as the hundredth are all converts to the principle. The Total Abstinence Society is a society of total abstainers; and if its members did not entirely

whether they were moderate or intemperate men) then are they real accessions and every body knows that he who does not drink at all cannot drink immoderately. Mr. S. may say that numbers of the poor abstain from necessity (insinuation again) since they have no means of drinking to excess; but if they do abstain they are not exposed to the temptation should an opportunity occur, and we all know that when the demon of intemperance gets into a poor man's habitation, the means will not be wanting so long as there remains an article to sell or pawn. There may have been a few silly cases similar to those mentioned by Mr. S. (page 21) where "infants at the breast have their names registered as members," or even where "a child unborn" is made a "teetotaller" by anticipation; and yet I commend the feeling which prompted such acts, as it showed that the parents were resolved to "train up a child in the way he should go."

We are told "the principle of *temperance*, (moderation) not total abstinence, is the principle of Christianity." Allow me to put the matter in another and as I imagine, a more correct shape, as far as the drunkard is concerned. "The principle of *total abstinence*, not temperance, (moderation) is the principle of Christianity." And why? Simply for this reason, that no drunkard can be moderate; he must take *none at all*, or he will take *too much*, and thus violate the principle of Christianity. Our former remarks will show that this is not "a mere human device;" and I do not forget that Mr. S. says "it is no new doctrine," meaning total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, which he affirms as we have seen, is "the only safety for a drunkard." "The popular panacea" proposes "to make men moral;" it leaves the grace of God to make them religious, but in not a few instances (blessed be God) has it led them to seek pardon for the past, without which reformation is in vain. Where it has not I do not wonder that many of them "are inflated with pharasaic pride and look down with contempt upon men infinitely their superiors in all moral and religious excellence." Is it not so in other cases besides that of the total abstainer? "The pharisees trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others;" this self-complacency is the spontaneous production of unregenerate nature, and until total abstainers get religion, such cases must be expected to exist. But the sobriety of abstainers is not the less excellent, because they are censorious; and if the Total Abstinence Society makes them sober, it is purely their own depravity that originates self-sufficiency and pride: abstinence has the praise of their sobriety, while irreligion has the blame of their uncharitableness. Yet I should not conclude with Mr. S. that there is less hope of their conversion, than of that "of publicans and harlots," especially if he means by these *the drunken depraved*. The irreligious confirmed drunkard is a far less hopeful subject for conversion than is the irreligious reclaimed drunkard: not only

because the latter may be expected to come under the sound of the gospel, but also because his besetting sin has been abandoned, and a formidable barrier to his conversion removed.

Again we are told, "the pious of past generations knew nothing of this remedy," and this says Mr. S. by total abstiners is "admitted." Mr. S. must not forget again that "it is no new doctrine" for drunkards totally to abstain. What then is admitted to be new? Simply the society for carrying the old doctrine into practice. It matters not where the system originated, whether "in the superior illumination of some American," or elsewhere; if it be only proved that the system is in itself good, this is sufficient to command my approbation. I have as decided an antipathy to American slavery as Mr. S. can possess but I would not reject total abstinence on that account. If he says, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth," I would boldly challenge him to "come and see." Much less would I insinuate (see Mr. S.'s title page and the fourth paragraph of his "Preface," where he talks of something being "artfully insinuated") that the "revivals of religion" in America were in fact no revivals at all. Were many of the poor slaves themselves, debarred *as such* from the consolations of religion. Mr. S. is not "prepared to say" (page 23, more insinuation) what connection the late revivals of religion in Cornwall had with the total abstinence reformation, but it would seem he thinks none at all. Nearly five thousand "were added to the Methodist Societies" and on Mr. S.'s supposition, four thousand of these were not "teetotallers." He surely does not mean that they were drunkards, or that the majority of them were drunkards; but simply that they were not total abstiners, and it is likely were most of them moderation-men. But supposing they were, this fact only shows that if men can be moderate, they are not unlikely to be converted in a revival of religion, as they are not debarred by intemperate habits, from the house of God and the ordinances of grace. On the other hand had they been, "not teetotallers," but drunkards, is it likely that so many of them would have been brought to God, without some preparing or reforming agency such as is furnished by the Total Abstinence Society. I imagine they would not have abandoned the Ale-bench for the Sanctuary; and it is an awful thought that whilst provision is made for the conversion of those of sober habits no such provision exists for those who are given up to the vice of drunkenness. But for the friendly aid of this society, even on Mr. S.'s own hypothesis, the four thousand it is probable, would not have swelled to nearly five thousand; but seven hundred and thirty drunkards were reclaimed, and being reclaimed, they came under the influence of the Word and Spirit of God and were happily converted. The total abstainer may then with some propriety exclaim, in the words put into his mouth by Mr. S. with only one or two more introduced to make the meaning of the whole more obvious. "See

how teetotalism prepares the way of the Lord ! How numerous are the conversions among teetotallers, (reformed drunkards) and how rare and few are they among those who use (immoderately) alcoholic drinks !”

Total abstinence does not attempt to improve upon, but to carry out Christianity in reference to one great branch of Christian morality. For Mr. S. to tell us, (page 24) that abstaining altogether is “unauthorised by the precepts, and at variance with the example of Christ” is really to say what has nothing at all to do with the matter. Was Christ a drunkard? for be it remembered, we only *insist* (and Mr. S. along with us) upon total abstinence in the case of drunkards and *invite* others to forego an indulgence, and to give an example, which if practically followed by intemperate persons will be made a blessing.

The society *itself*, as a means to an end is acknowledged to be a novelty. Mr. S. seeks to exhibit a difference between this and other novelties for christian objects. But how does he make the attempt? Merely by asserting that other “societies are in perfect harmony both with the precepts and example of Christ; whereas teetotalism is certainly not sanctioned by the example of Christ, and in one instance, at least, is at variance with his precept.” I presume he refers to the command “Do this in remembrance of me.” But Christ addressed himself to his disciples who were not drunkards but sober men; and that command to commemorate the Redeemer’s death is binding upon all believers: still it is not inconsistent with, or opposed to the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, as a daily and ordinary *beverage* Christ’s example, as we have seen, does not oppose the principle of total abstinence, as the only remedy for drunkenness. But why argue from the example of Christ at all in reference to the *detail* of Christian operations? He came to establish Christianity itself, to labour the great scheme or economy of man’s redemption; and having furnished the evidences, doctrines, morals, and institutions of Christianity, he has left the Christian world to promulgate the system by every possible variety of means. These means must indeed harmonize “with the precepts and example of Christ;” and here I would beg to alter Mr. S.’s phraseology a little in order clearly to understand his argument. “These societies,” he says, meaning Bible, Missionary, and Sunday School societies, “are in perfect harmony both with the precepts and example of Christ; whereas teetotalism is not in perfect harmony with both the precepts and example of Christ.” This is, as the case should be put, to secure logical exactness; though perhaps the repetition in full may sound somewhat harsh and grating to the ear. The two parts of the sentence are the exact counterpart of each other, the one being a positive, and the other a negative affirmation. The above stated defect of harmony in the case

such defect, as Mr. Osborn has it, "You say Yes. I say No. You appeal to the Scripture. So do I. The issue is now fairly joined and we will go into the evidence." How does Mr. S. attempt to prove his point? Thus, "'Search the Scriptures,' said Christ. Bible societies are established to enable the people to do so." Good. "'Go into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature,' was the command of the risen Saviour. Missionary societies are formed to enable the Church to obey this command." Very good. "Christ taught the people, and Timothy from a child knew the Holy Scriptures; and Sunday Schools are established, that the rising generation, like young Timothy, may be made wise unto salvation." Still very good. But why does Mr. S. alter his track when the obnoxious principle of total abstinence is to be tested, instead of prosecuting his argument in the same form? Perhaps it was convenient to do so; but I will go on with it. "Be not drunk with wine," says Christ's Apostle; and the Total Abstinence Society is established, as a preventive of, and a remedy for drunkenness. Does Mr. S. retort, But this society is not in harmony with the precepts and example of Christ: He neither established, nor commanded to be established such a society, and his own precept and example are in opposition to its principle. That it is not the case I have already shown; and for the rest I reply, neither did Christ establish nor command to be established, Bible, Missionary, or Sunday School societies: He left his Church to devise and to execute the best and most efficient plans (plans not opposed to his precepts and example) for carrying out his injunctions into full effect.

To the next paragraph (page 25) I think it only needful to reply, that Puseyism and Owenism, are unnecessarily dragged into the present controversy, with a view to depreciate by alleged association, the principle of the Total Abstinence Society. Does Mr. S. wish to amalgamate the superstition of Puseyism, and the infidelity of Owenism, with the morality of the gospel in one of its important features as promoted by the body of total abstiners? "What is the chaff to the wheat saith the Lord?" Let me tell him that though a Puseyite or an Owenite may be a total abstainer, it does not therefore follow that every abstainer is involved in the absurdities of the Pusey, or the impieties of the Owen school. Has he forgot that there are both "intelligent and religious members of the Total Abstinence Society, for whom he entertains a high esteem?" What he advances about "wonderful discoveries" may be exhibited in its proper light, if we only transfer it from total abstinence to missionary operations. No one will question that never was there a period, when missionary objects were so successfully and universally prosecuted as the present. But an Anti-Missionary Advocate remarks upon it all in the most contemptuous and disparaging terms. Perhaps he borrows a leaf out of Mr. S.'s book, and then proceeds to

exclaiming, "These are wonderful discoveries! How different from the days of ignorance which God winked at, the dark days of the Apostles; of Luther and Melancthon and Calvin; of the pious but ignorant puritans; and of the but half-enlightened Wesley and Whitfield, and many others, who have been reputed eminent in the Christian Church." How unworthy and disreputable would such language be, to issue from the mouth of a professed Christian. And yet when the Christian world has formed a Missionary society for more extensive and efficient Missionary operations, it very properly is smiled upon by a Christian Minister; but alas! when a Total Abstinence Society is formed for the cure of one fearfully prevalent species of immorality, it is frowned upon with perfect scorn and indignation. *O tempora, O mores!*

The instances adduced by Mr. S. (page 26) of an improper and unchristian spirit, manifested by some total abstainers, are much to be regretted. I decidedly object to the manner in which the interests of the society have been often advocated, and am fully of opinion that great disservice has been done the cause by the intemperate speeches sometimes delivered. This after all is no sufficient reason why I should discountenance the society itself; (for what good thing has not been abused?) and since the society has clearly a moral and christian object in view, (for who will question that the cure of drunkenness is such an object?) it is entitled to my serious consideration if not my personal and direct co-operation. Perhaps a great deal of the unbecoming spirit, of which Mr. S. very properly complains, is after all to be attributed, to the open opposition the society has met with, from those who if they could not co-operate, ought at least to have been silent. But to conclude that "such unhappily are too frequently the accompaniments of teetotalism upon the minds of its members," is, to say the least of it, a judgment not according to charity and not consistent with truth. It is not so, with really "intelligent and religious members of the Total Abstinence Society;" and where neither intelligence nor religion are found, it is not to be wondered at, and does not merit the distinction of being noticed.

What follows on page 27 is insinuation, but total abstainers, who were never accustomed to drink immoderately can well bear it for the sake of the cause. Mr. S. has made *one* little blunder which perhaps may as well be corrected. He calls total abstinence the medicine for the plague of intemperance; and so it is, but it cannot be medicine (remedy administered by a physician, see Walker) when taken by those who are in perfect health, since "they that are whole need not a physician" nor a physician's remedy. It is however a medicine not personally but relatively, as it is taken, to induce others to take it; and as no *personal* harm can come of the use of a *negative* remedy, I would advise Mr. S. to give the society the countenance of his example and try it too.

Far be it from me to depreciate the labours, or undervalue the piety of those Christian Ministers, who refuse to become total abstainers; but neither let them underrate the utility of a society which must be regarded as a powerful auxiliary to the success of

the gospel. It is sometimes of paramount importance to pluck first of all the "*one fruit from the corrupt tree*;" (page 28) because it may contain the seeds of extensive and wide-spreading corruption, which if suffered to vegetate and grow would prove the prolific source of incalculable mischief. The Christian Minister may indeed "lay the axe to the root" of the tree, and preach conversion to sober, church or chapel-going men; but this society *makes* many drunkards sober, and *brings* them to the house of God.

Mr. S. thinks "drunkenness is by no means prevalent in religious society." But let me ask, Has it not come under his observation, that by far the greater number of cases of backsliders whose names he has had to erase from the class-books of the Wesleyan society, were persons who had fallen away through intemperance? How many might have been saved to the Church, had they acted upon the principle of total abstinence; but they took the intoxicating cup, and were unhappily overcome! Total abstainers would also claim the benefit of St. Paul's advice for themselves, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." They profess to be so persuaded, and therefore they say to their opponents "Let not him that eateth (or drinketh) despise him that eateth (drinketh) not." On the 21st verse of the 14th chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, and the use made of it by total abstainers, Mr. S. remarks, (page 30) "the cases are not at all parallel," and instances in three particulars what he considers to be the difference; to all which I reply, that though the circumstances may differ, the principle is the same precisely. If drinking wine though moderately, gives an example of *drinking at all*; it gives that to the immoderate drinker which leads, in his case, to sinful excess. The Apostle's conclusion therefore is, "It is not good to drink wine *whereby another* stumbleth or is offended or is made weak." Mr. Osborn endeavours to invalidate this reasoning, by putting what he calls a parallel case; as if there was the same likelihood, or the same danger of eating immoderately, "say of beef, or mutton, or fowl, or pheasant;" as of drinking immoderately "of alcoholic drinks, whether wine, spirits, malt liquor, cider, or perry." Had he placed with the above edibles, a certain potable called water, he might have remained in the undisturbed possession of his parallel. Besides, gluttony and drunkenness are not kindred evils either in their prevalence or their general effects. Mr. S. has truly stated the views of total abstainers when he says, "Cases may exist where a good man may be placed in such circumstances that for the preservation of others from the sin of drunkenness, he, for a season, may find it expedient to abstain." Why then has Mr. S. all this time, been opposing them, endeavouring in 32 pages to prove that the principle of total abstinence is utterly powerless, as an example to induce drunkards to abstain? He here gives up all his argument and all his reasoning and frankly concedes what he had vainly endeavoured to disprove. The only difference between Mr. S. and total abstainers is, that he contemplates *possible* and they *existing* cases. Their statement is, "Cases *do* exist, where a good man *is* placed in such circumstances that for the preservation of others from the sin of drunkenness, he, for a season, (I would say altogether, for a return to the use of alcoholic

drinks is perilling the cases of recovery) *finds* it expedient to abstain." Only let a man remember that he is a citizen of the world, instead of confining himself within a narrow circle of society, and he will find numerous cases upon which his own example of entire abstinence will serve to operate successfully.

I have now finished my remarks on the pamphlet of this author, and have argued the principle of entire abstinence solely on the ground of expediency; and in the case of moderate men not for personal but for relative considerations. I am not aware that anything material to the argument has escaped my observation, but some paragraphs I have purposely passed over, as being quite irrelevant to the position I have taken. I should be very sorry were total abstainers "to re-cross the Rubicon" and return to "moderation" as it is technically called; since in that case, many would fall into their former habits of excessive drinking, while the example of others would be lost to the drunken portion of society.

APPENDIX.

Since writing this Pamphlet, I have read the *Strictures* of Mr. Charleton on Mr. Stanley's Pamphlet, and find that on the subjects of animadversion which are common to us, we are *one*. It would seem that Mr. Charleton takes Mr. Macdonald's view of "the points of controversy between our author and (his) friend," and considers his "friend's 'Apology' to contain its own vindication." This he is perfectly at liberty to do, while a large class of individuals (the Rev. J. A. James if I mistake not among the number) differ from him on the physical effects of alcoholic drinks on the human system, who are not a wit less friendly on that account to the Temperance Reformation. I confess too I cannot understand how Mr. Charleton can consistently enter his protest against "extravagant and revolting statements respecting the abstract sinfulness of the use of wine," while he remains of the same opinion with that expressed in the "Apology" of his "friend." Nor is there any impropriety in referring "to the longevity of Mr. Wesley in proof of the harmlessness of intoxicating liquors;" for it is well known that he was a moderate drinker, and the harmlessness of *moderate* drinking is all that is intended to be maintained. On the whole Mr. Charleton's "Strictures" are valuable, but as they are intentionally brief, many subjects are passed over which in the preceding pages are discussed.

I have also read Mr. Turner's "Letter" to Mr. Stanley, and find that most of his reasonings are in accordance with my own. Still however I must take exception to one or two instances.

Mr. T. does not take it upon him to prove that moderate drinking is prejudicial to health,—for this I imagine would be a somewhat difficult task,—but he insinuates as much, and this amounts to the same thing as far as his opinion is concerned. Now here we differ, for I cannot say, “My own experience, and that of many with whom I am acquainted, all tend to convince my own mind that man’s animal frame would be stronger, and therefore his intellectual powers would be clearer, were the use of intoxicating liquors never (moderately) indulged in.” I cannot think that the Saviour would himself take, or allow others to take as a beverage, a drink that was in itself positively injurious. But he did take, and allow to be taken, fermented and intoxicating wines, on festal and other occasions; so that they must have been harmless and agreeable, if not useful and serviceable. It is however a valuable observation, “that although the *letter* of the law, cannot require him (the religious teetotaler) to deny himself, what our Saviour’s example has given him authority to use, still the *spirit* of it does.”

I must demur to another of Mr. Turner’s arguments, and the illustrations which accompany it. He says, “It (meaning moderation) is only asserted to be sinful, if such moderation is the cause of sin in others. The act itself is not sinful,” but (if I understand Mr. Turner aright he would further say) the *example* is. This I cannot concede, for it is not the moderation of the sober, but the excess of the intemperate, that makes a man a drunkard. Yet though a moderate example is not blameworthy, an abstinent example on the contrary is praiseworthy; for though the former is not the cause of the evil, the latter may be a means to prevent or remove it. An example of moderation is not therefore, “the razor of self-destruction in the maniac’s way;” and as for the illustration from the cards, I think it singularly inapt, and by far too lenient a condemnation of card-playing, to proceed from the pen of a Clergyman. Cards are an evil, not only because of their use in gambling, but also as Mr. Turner intimates, because of the time wasted upon them. Mr. Turner thinks there is far more time wasted over the wine-cup by moderate drinkers; and yet could this be proved to be the case, it would be no palliation of the enormous evil of card-playing, which is a decided act of conformity to the world. But he forgets that conversation, even religious conversation is not prevented over a glass of wine; whereas a silly and unmeaning game at cards absorbs the whole attention. I would however banish the wine-cup from the social table, for the sake of the intemperate, though its introduction there cannot be regarded as a sin.

Mr. Turner’s pamphlet contains however many excellent arguments and observations. I fully concur in the remark, that the recent formation of an Abstinence Society, no more reflects upon

the piety of former times, than does the recent formation of a Bible Society; for if it does in the one case it does also in the other, a position which Mr. Stanley would be very unwilling to admit. It is also a conclusive argument where Mr. Stanley is asked, "Could these societies have been formed by drunkards? Would they ever have existed if the sober, the temperate, and the religious, had not come forward to aid in their establishment? And if you allow them to be necessary for the drunkard, is it less necessary that the sober should help to form and support them?"

I am happy to meet with the following argument in the same work, as it so exactly accords with my own expressed views on the same subject. Mr. Turner addressing Mr. Stanley remarks, "'Example,' you say, 'to be influential must be visible.' Granted; and therefore, I am a pledged member of an Abstinence Society. The intemperate and the drunkard are not amongst the number of my acquaintances and friends, and consequently, in order to make my example visible, I was compelled to number myself amongst the total abstainers."

I cannot close this reference to Mr. Turner's pamphlet, without a further recommendation of the work, by the citation of a few more of the choice passages it contains. I do this the more readily as the selections will show how nearly we agree, notwithstanding a few unimportant differences of opinion. On the *right* to abstain, (a subject referred to in the 7th page of my pamphlet) Mr. Turner very properly remarks, "As to the drinking of intoxicating liquors, if it be absurd and unscriptural to assert that such a practice is sinful, it is surely more absurd and more unscriptural to argue that the abstaining from them is offensive in the eyes of God." The force of this remark will be apparent, when it is remembered that such abstinence is an act of self-denial, of generous, philanthropic sacrifice with a view to the reclaiming of the drunkard from his sin.

Another excellent passage I will venture to give for the reason already assigned, that Mr. Turner's views are in the main, in accordance with my own. "I know not" he says, "how to separate the two things (the advocacy of total abstinence principles and the preaching of the gospel) any more than I can disjoin the faith on which my soul's salvation rests, and the works by which that faith is evidenced. Now in the drunkard's path, the first stumbling-block (to his conversion) is the besetting sin; (intoxication) remove this, and I do not say all shall follow, but it may. Take away what hinders him from hearing the preaching of the gospel, and who shall say that God will not bless that preaching to his heart, and the converted drunkard become by his renewing grace, a new man? This is the means which my reason, and my experience, urge me to adopt, and if I find them successful, if I know that these (total abstinence) societies have converted more drunkards in a short time than the preaching of the gospel

has hitherto done in our land, it is not that I blame the gospel as defective, but because I think that gospel has not been brought to bear with all the force and wisdom that it might. Do not think then, that we consider Christianity less the finished and perfect will of God than you do. We look for no new revelation, neither enforce a plan for the removal of sin which we believe to be unauthorised by the gospel, or at variance with the Saviour's example." This is a lengthened quotation, but it could not well be abridged without injury to the argument, which I consider is most triumphant.

One more quotation shall suffice, remarkable at once for the beauty of its style, and the piety of its sentiment. "That it (total abstinence) may have created in many hearts a spirit of pharisaical pride, I have too much cause to fear. That the man who suddenly finds himself a changed and altered character, may be led to look too much on the strength of his own right arm, as if that had achieved for him the victory, knowing what the heart of man is, I doubt will not unfrequently be the case. But if one sinner through the instrumentality of that society in my own parish, which my adhesion to has tended to strengthen and support, shall in the course of those remaining days which Divine Providence may yet allot me, be brought in true humility to the Saviour's cross—then, if there be one promise of that Saviour I can confidently rely on, it is that I shall not lose my reward."

In conclusion I would say that the *relative* position I have taken, is quite sufficient to accomplish all the objects proposed by the Total Abstinence Society, whether for the cure or the prevention of the evil of drunkenness. Abstinence *is* abstinence on whatever grounds it be taken up, and where abstinence is practised, the evil complained of, will be both prevented and removed. This philanthropic principle of abstinence is likely also to conciliate many who are now ranged in the ranks of the opposition on the great question of the Temperance Reformation.

FINIS.